

**R marks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of the subject application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 15 are pending in the subject application.

The claims of the subject application are directed to a method and apparatus for comparing on a visual display information from a plurality of different items. In claim 1, for example, within information for each of the plurality of items, passages which relate to a category of information are identified with a common tag. In the visual display, a different display area is provided for each of the plurality of items; and in each of the display areas, the passage identified by a designated common tag is displayed for the item to which the display area corresponds, so that the passages for the different items are observable at the same time.

**Telephonic Interview Summary**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Chuong and Supervisory Patent Examiner Kincaid for their time and consideration afforded the undersigned attorney in a telephonic interview conducted on May 24, 2004. During the interview features of the present invention were discussed, along with USP 5,870,559 to Lesham et al., and possible claim amendments to distinguish the art of record. During the interview, it was discussed how the current art of record could be distinguished by the addition of terminology which would make clearer that information from the different items being compared was visible on the visual display at the same time. For example, the addition of the word "simultaneously" in element "c" of claim 1 was discussed. Although the Examiners indicated that such a clarification would distinguish the art currently of record, it was also indicated that such an amendment would be considered a "new consideration" which would require additional searching.

Amendments to the Claims:

By the subject amendment, claims 1, 7, 12 and 15 have been amended to recite that the information being compared comes from different items, and to further clarify the timing of when the information from the different items is displayed on the visual display. For example, claim 1 recites in displaying step "c" that the displaying is "so that the passages are observable at the same time." Claim 12 has also been amended to add similar terminology. Claim 7 has been amended in step "d" so that the displaying is "simultaneously." Claim 15 has been amended to recite a third routine which displays the reports "at substantially the same time" in each of the plurality of frames.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 have been amended to change the term "item(s)" to "different item(s)" in order to conform the antecedent bases in these dependent claims to reflect the amendments made to independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 15.

Support for the above amendments can be found in Figs. 1 and 2, for example, of the subject application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

In paragraph 4 of the Official Action, made final, mailed February 27, 2004, the Examiner continued his rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Leshem et al.; and in paragraph 6, rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freidman et al, USP 6,360,188.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Amended claims 1,7,12 and 15 now more clearly recite that the claimed invention provides comparative information on the visual display about a plurality of different items, in contrast to Leshem et al.'s providing information about the same item in different images. Further, claim 1 now recites in the displaying step "c" that the displaying is "so that the passages are observable at the same time." (Claim 12 has also been amended to add similar terminology.) Claim 7 has been amended in step "d" so

that the displaying is "simultaneously." Claim 15 has been amended to recite a third routing which displays the reports "at substantially the same time" in each of the plurality of frames. It is respectfully submitted that Leshem et al. does not teach, suggest or make obvious such features.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 7, 12 and 15 are allowable over the art of record. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 13 and 14, as dependent from allowable base claims, are themselves allowable.

For the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's indication to that end is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich LLP

By: 

Gerald T. Sekimura

Reg. No. 30,103

Tel.: 415-836-2500

Attachments